



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/083,312	02/25/2002	David Kammer	PALM-3741.US.P	5496

7590 08/19/2005

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP  
Third Floor  
Two North Market Street  
San Jose, CA 95113

EXAMINER

TRAN, TUAN A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2682	

DATE MAILED: 08/19/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b><i>Advisory Action</i></b> <b><i>Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief</i></b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/083,312	<b>Applicant(s)</b> KAMMER ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Tuan A. Tran	<b>Art Unit</b> 2682	

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 27 July 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

#### AMENDMENTS

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
- (a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
- (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
- (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
- (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. ☐ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
- The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
- Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_.
- Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_.
- Claim(s) rejected: \_\_\_\_\_.
- Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

#### AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

#### REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER


11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The Applicant's arguments (See Remark) are not persuasive. First, the Applicant argued that Cannon teaches away from the claimed embodiments by disclosing a conventional Bluetooth discovery process. The Examiner respectfully disagrees with the Applicant's arguments because Cannon teaches a Bluetooth device is capable of establishing communications with other Bluetooth devices within an established piconet (Bluetooth discovery procedure has been taken place in order to establish the piconet) from a list (pairing list) obtained by conducting a procedure for pairing not by the Bluetooth discovery process (See fig. 1 and pages 2-3 [0033-0037]). Second, the Applicant argued that the proposed modification of Cannon in view of Pinder must change the principle of operation of Cannon and the combined teachings of Cannon and Pinder does not teach or suggest the claimed embodiments. The Examiner respectfully disagrees with the Applicant's arguments because Cannon does teach a Bluetooth device is capable of establishing communications with other Bluetooth devices within an established piconet in response to communication requests that carried PIN(s) or pass codes as well as inherently source device ID matching with the stored PIN(s) or pass codes. However, Cannon does not mention that the Bluetooth device rejecting a Bluetooth communication request if the device ID is not a member of the list of trusted device IDs. Pinder teaches a method of rejecting a mobile communication request comprising: receiving a mobile communication request at a mobile device, wherein the communication request is a page message and comprises a source mobile device ID; automatically accessing on the mobile device a memory resident list of trusted device IDs (acceptance list); and rejecting a mobile communication request if the device ID is not a member of the list of trusted device IDs (See above rejections for more details). Since both Cannon and Pinder teach method of establishing wireless connection, one in short range (Bluetooth) and the other in long range (cellular), between mobile devices; therefore Cannon, in combination with Pinder, would arrive to the claimed embodiments.

12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office  
PTOL-303 (Rev. 4-05)

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Part of Paper No. 08082005

  
LEE NGUYEN  
PRIMARY EXAMINER